



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in like manner, one tissue of unprincipled, reckless assertions, for which one seeks in vain for proof or evidence.

We have much sympathy for, what we believe to be, the errors of our brethren who have been brought up in the Roman Catholic religion, and who having been trained from childhood to believe in its doctrines, now use their adult reason—not in seeking for truth, but in seeking for arguments to defend the conclusions from the belief of which they cannot wean themselves.

But the case is very different with those who have given up Protestantism for Romanism. They have been able to arrive at this result only by shutting their eyes to the truth, and abandoning all exercise of their reason, and swallowing down implicitly whatever may be proposed to them by those whom they have thought proper to receive as authorities. And so they generally present the pitiable spectacle exhibited by Mr. Faber in his book, being wholly unable to discriminate between truth and falsehood; given over to strong delusion, that they should believe a lie. We can only pray God to have mercy upon them, that they may recover themselves from the snare of the devil, who have been taken captive by him at his will.

MODERN WORSHIP IN ROME.—No. III.

INDULGENCES.

CARDINAL Wiseman has at length returned to England, after a residence of several months at Rome. Various speculations were put forward in the newspapers as to the cause of his protracted absence from his diocese; and some persons went so far as to say, that some cogent reasons, connected with pecuniary matters, rendered it unlikely that he would ever return; but the Cardinal's presence in England is a sufficient reply to all such uncharitable surmises. We are by no means sorry that he is once more amongst us. We like a bold and manly antagonist; and we cannot forget that, some years since, when all England was ringing with indignation on the occasion of the Papal aggression, Cardinal Wiseman had the courage to come forward, in the face of the country, and to attempt a justification of the bold step then taken by the Court of Rome—a step of which he was supposed to be the chief adviser, and by which he was certainly one of the greatest gainers. We are no friends to the assumption of undue authority, which the Church of Rome has recently made in these countries; but, at the same time, we cannot but acknowledge that we would far rather have to do with open and avowed opponents, like Cardinal Wiseman or Archbishop MacHale, than the soft, smooth, and occasionally unscrupulous antagonists of the past generation—such as Bishop Milner.

Cardinal Wiseman's first step, on his return from the Eternal City, was to issue a pastoral letter to the clergy and people of his diocese, which is given, at some length, in the *Tablet* of the 17th of June last. We took up the paper with a good deal of curiosity, as we were anxious to have the latest and most authentic intelligence of what the Pope and Cardinals were doing at Rome; and, moreover, we wished to learn what subjects were considered by Cardinal Wiseman himself as the most pressing and important, on such an interesting occasion.

When the father of a family pays a visit to the metropolis, we all know how eagerly the children look forward to his return; how they talk of the things that he is likely to bring home with him; and with what eager curiosity they look on, as he pulls out of his pockets the toys and presents which he has selected for each. It must have been with some such feelings, we doubt not, that the faithful people of Westminster took up Cardinal Wiseman's pastoral letter. After such a protracted absence, they must surely have anticipated that he would not return to his diocese without bringing them back some mark of regard and remembrance from the city which Roman Catholics are fondly wont to regard as the metropolis of the Christian world. In this feeling we ourselves, in some degree, participated. We knew that Cardinal Wiseman had recently taken part in the solemn inauguration of the relics of a new saint, at Amiens, in France,* whose bones had been dug up not long since, out of the catacombs of Rome; and when such presents were to be had, we thought it unlikely that the Cardinal would return to his own flock at home, without some pledge and token of Pontifical favour, to indemnify them for all the obloquy they had lately endured in the cause of the Church of Rome.

We glanced hastily over the earlier part of the pastoral, in which the Cardinal expresses in suitable terms his thankfulness for his safe return. "Before all things, dearly beloved," saith he, "we give thanks to God, that he has been pleased to bring us back safe, after a long absence, to resume the labours of our unworthy ministry among you." He then goes on to announce his intention of holding a diocesan synod at Westminster, which was shortly to commence its sittings, in order to settle some matters of pressing importance. At length, after passing over some other topics, we came to the close of the letter. Every one knows that the most important part of a lady's letter is generally to be found in the postscript; and we thought it not unlikely that the Cardinal, coming fresh from Italy, "la terra di donne e di gentilezza," might

have imitated this laudable example. We hoped that he would tell us something about the last Saint that was canonized, or the last procession at which the Holy Father assisted, or the last new doctrine which the Pope and Cardinals had agreed upon; nay, perhaps, we thought it even possible that he might be able to announce to us that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, after a contest of so many centuries, had now, at last, been authoritatively declared to be a fundamental tenet of the infallible Church.

But, alas! we were sadly disappointed. The last clause of the Cardinal's letter runs as follows:—"We hereby grant to every one of the clergy or laity who shall recite the hymn of the Holy Ghost, 'Veni Creator,' in Latin or English, between the publication of this, our pastoral letter, and the close of the synod, to obtain for us the light of the Divine Spirit, an indulgence of one hundred days each time."

And is this all that the Cardinal brings back from Rome? Only one hundred days' indulgence! Really, this appears to be a very stingy and shabby proceeding on his part. One hundred days! Why, in the old Sarum Office of the Virgin,* we find mention made of an indulgence for no less than 90,000 years. "Thys three prayers be wyrtten in the chappelle of the holy crosse in Rome, otherwise called Sacellum sancte crucis septem Romanorum, whoo that devoutly say them shall obtayn 90,000 years of pardon for dedly synnes, graunted of our holie Father, John XXII., Pope of Rome." We think the Pope might have made them the full hundred thousand, when his hand was in. Perhaps he thought that some little economy was requisite, even in a Pope.

This, however, is not all. The recipient of the liberality of John XXII. was obliged to say three prayers for his Indulgence; but Cardinal Bellarmine tells us how a full plenary indulgence may be obtained, without saying any prayers at all. "We see," saith he, "that the *very greatest indulgences* are sometimes given for the most trifling reasons—as, for instance, when a plenary indulgence is given to every individual of the crowd that stand before the door of St. Peter's on Easter Sunday, when the Pope blesses the people." "Videmus interdum pro causa levissimā dari indulgentias maximas, ut cum datur Indulgentia plenaria omnibus qui ante fores Basilicæ Sancti Petri astant, dum Summus Pontifex in die Paschæ populo solemniter benedicit."—Bellarm. de Indul., lib. i., cap. xii., tom. ii., p. 453. Col., 1615.

It is right, however, to add, that Bellarmine appears to have found some difficulty in swallowing the belief of these wholesale indulgences. "If," saith he, "indulgences, granted without sufficient reason, are not good and valid, the Christian people would be grievously deceived by their pastors;† an assertion, to the truth of which we most cordially assent.

Granting, however, for the moment, that the Pope does not deceive the good people of Rome, when he promises them a plenary indulgence for standing at the door of St. Peter's on Easter Sunday, does not the lavish profusion with which the gifts of the Church are bestowed abroad, contrast strangely with Cardinal Wiseman's niggardly and parsimonious distribution of the same gifts at home? At Westminster, a devout Roman Catholic offers up a prayer to God, and obtains a hundred days' exemption from the burning torments of Purgatory. At Rome, an Italian, who, perchance, never prays to God at all, obtains a clear quittance, perhaps of several thousand years' purgatorial tortures, merely by enduring for a moment a little pushing and jostling in a crowd! We ask our readers, in all sincerity, can such things be true? If they are, we must fairly avow, that the grounds and reasons of them are beyond our comprehension. If they are not, we can only repeat, with Cardinal Bellarmine—"the Christian people must be grievously deceived by their pastors."

We have, on more than one occasion, brought the general subject of indulgences before our readers;‡ but the mention so recently made of them in Cardinal Wiseman's Pastoral, induces us to revert to the subject again; and we shall endeavour, in our remarks, to afford our readers some help in enabling them to form their own opinion upon a question which, if true, is of such vital and practical importance.

Many years ago, in wandering along the streets of Rome, our attention was frequently arrested by a Latin sentence which we saw deeply cut in stone over the porticoes of many of the countless churches which meet the eye at every step. The sentence ran thus:—

INDULGENTIA PLENARIA, QUOTIDIANA, PERPETUA, PRO VIVIS ET MORTUIS, TOTIES QUOTIES.

—i.e., "A plenary, daily, perpetual indulgence for the living and for the dead, as often as they are wanted." Often, as we read these words, the inquiry suggested itself to our mind, What is an indulgence? On what authority does it rest? Is there any Scriptural authority for this usage? These questions we shall endeavour briefly to discuss.

And, firstly, what is an indulgence? On this point the Council of Trent was prudently silent. It tells us that the

use of indulgences is very salutary for Christian people, and approved of by the authority of sacred councils (indulgentiarum usum Christiano populo maxime salutarem, et sacrorum conciliorum auctoritate probatum, Sess. xxv.); but it cautiously abstains from telling us what an indulgence is—nay, more, it is forced to admit that very great abuses have been introduced into the Church by their means. Cardinal Wiseman, however, is more explicit than the Council of Trent. He states* very clearly his opinion, both what an indulgence is not, and what it is. "Many persons," saith he, "will be inclined to incredulity when I tell them, that an indulgence is *no pardon for sin of any sort*, past, present, or future. It is no more than a remission by the Church, in virtue of the keys, of a portion, or the entire, of the temporal punishment due to sin."

The learned Cardinal seemed to be well aware that this statement was one which his readers would be inclined to disbelieve, and which, therefore, he was bound to make with the utmost care and precision. And, yet, when he tells us so positively, that "an indulgence is no pardon for sin of any sort," we think that he must have relied greatly on the ignorance or simplicity of his readers. Pope Boniface VIII., as is well known, issued indulgences on a large scale, in connection with the Jubilee which he celebrated in the year 1300; and in what form of words were they drawn up? We find them given as follows in the canon law—"Nonsolum plenam et largiorem, immo plenissimam concedimus omnium suorum veniam peccatorum."† "We grant not only a full and more abundant, but a *most plenary pardon of all sins*." So, likewise, Clement VI., in his Bull for the Jubilee of the year 1350, granted to the recipients of his indulgences, that "they should obtain a most plenary pardon of all their sins."‡ Sixtus IV. also, calls them "indulgences and remissions of sins."§ We have before us an extract of a form of indulgence granted by Leo X., taken from the well-known Roman Catholic writer Ferraris,|| where several examples of a similar kind are given. The form of words made use of in these indulgences is very generally as follows:—"We mercifully grant in the Lord a plenary indulgence and remission of all their sins, by these presents, to be valid for all future times, with a power of applying the same plenary indulgence to the souls in Purgatory."¶

Now, we ask any of our readers, what is the plain meaning of the words "plenary remission, to be valid for all future times, of all their sins" (plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum remissionem)? Do they, or do they not, mean that the sins of the man to whom they are addressed are fully forgiven? If they do, then with what face can Cardinal Wiseman assert, that "an indulgence is no pardon for sin of any sort, past, present, or future"? If they do not, how can the Popes for many hundred years be exonerated from the charge of using language upon the most solemn of all subjects, which was calculated to lead Christian people into the most fatal error, in reference to the pardon of their sins in the sight of God?

Cardinal Wiseman was fully aware of this difficulty, which, indeed, lies at the bottom of the whole Romish theory of indulgences. It was, therefore, impossible for him to avoid taking some notice of it; and we invite the special attention of our readers to his reply. "When an indulgence," saith he, "is said to be a remission or forgiveness of sin, the phrase applies *only to the outward guilt*, or that portion of the evil, whereof the ancient penitential canons took cognizance."** There is no weapon more convenient for a controversial writer than a bold assertion, to help him in disposing of an awkward fact, or evading an unmanageable argument; and, certainly, few writers are more expert in the use of this weapon, or have had recourse to it more frequently, than the Cardinals of the Church of Rome. The phrase *forgiveness of sins*, it seems, applies *only to the outward guilt*! Now, we ask any impartial persons who have read the extracts we have quoted above, how can they possibly believe this statement of Cardinal Wiseman's? If the forgiveness of sins, spoken of in the indulgences, meant only an exemption from the penitential discipline of the Church, why was it not so stated in these documents? Why was a form of words made use of, the most complete and comprehensive that could possibly be employed? The indulgence is called "plenaria remissio," a plenary remission; "plenissima venia," a most full pardon; "omnium peccatorum," of *all sins*. And what is Cardinal Wiseman's comment on these words? "The forgiveness of sins applies *only to the outward guilt*!" "An indulgence is *no pardon for sin of any sort, past, present, or future*!" Well may the learned Cardinal anticipate the incredulity of his readers, when he makes such statements as these. We ask him, if he really wished to convey to any man the idea that his sins were entirely pardoned in the sight of God, would it be possible for him

* Vide Lectures on the Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church, vol. ii. p. 71. London, 1836.

† Extravag. Comm., lib. v., c. i, De penit. Corpus Juris Can., vol. iii., p. 319. Lugdun, 1771.

‡ Suorum omnium obtinerent plenissimam veniam peccatorum. Id., cap. ii., vol. iii., p. 353.

§ Indulgentias et remissiones peccatorum. Id. cap. iv., vol. iii., p. 355.

|| Vide Ferraris. Bibl. Prompt. sub voce. "Indulgentia," Tom. iv., pp. 98, 111. Bonon., 1758.

¶ "Plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus, presentibus perpetuis futuris temporibus valiturus, cum facultate etiam eandem plenariam indulgentiam applicandi animabus in Purgatorio."—Ferraris ut supra, p. 98.

** Wiseman's Lectures, ut supra, p. 83.

* Horæ B. V. Mariæ secundum usum Sarum, fol. lxii. b. Printed at the expense of the University of Paris, 1536.

† "Si Indulgentia sine causa satis magna concessa non esset rate, Christianus populus à Pastoribus suis graviter deciperetur."—Bellarm. ibid.

‡ Vide CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. i., p. 114, vol. ii., p. 6.

* S. Theodosia. The ceremony took place, we believe, on the 12th of October last.—vide the *Tablet* of that month.

to use language more full, comprehensive, and unmistakable, than that which we have quoted above from the authorized indulgences, not of one, but of several Popes? Is this a specimen of the infallible teaching of the Church of Rome, which Christian people are expected to receive in blind and unresisting submission? We confidently appeal to our readers whether, in the whole course of their experience, they have ever met with an instance of more gross and glaring contradiction?

But we need not rely merely on the language of the Papal indulgences. The history of the Church, for the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, proves, conclusively, the meaning which the Church of Rome then intended the people to put, and which they actually did put, on the indulgences issued in her name, and with her express sanction. Of this, the ancient writer, Gobelinus, furnishes us with a remarkable proof.* He says that the preachers of indulgences told the people, to encourage them to deal with them, that the indulgences were not only a *pœna*, but a *culpa* too—i.e., not merely from the temporal punishment of sin, but from the fault itself, which deserved eternal punishment. This made the people look into them; and not finding those terms, but only a most plenary remission, they were unsatisfied, because they were told the fault could only be forgiven by God alone; but if they could but once find that the Pope would undertake to clear all scores with God for them, they did not doubt but the indulgences would be worth their money. "Whereupon," adds Gobelinus, "those very terms were put into them;" then the wiser men thought these were counterfeit, and made only by the pardon-mongers; but, upon further inquiry, they found it otherwise.

We may add another example from the general form of absolution, sold by Tetzel, under the direct authority of Leo X.† We need scarcely recall to the recollection of our readers, that the shameful sale of indulgences, by Tetzel and others, was the immediate cause of the Reformation in the sixteenth century. The absolution concluded as follows:—"I restore thee to the holy sacraments of the Church, and to the unity of the faithful, and to the innocence and purity conferred on thee by baptism; so that the gates of punishment may be closed against thee at thy departure, and those of the joys of Paradise be opened. Or, shouldst thou not presently die, let this grace remain in full force, and avail thee at the point of death. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—F. B. Johannes Tetzel, Sub-commissionarius, manu propria scripsit."

Can any unprejudiced person read these words without being convinced that the Church of Rome, at that time, plainly and unquestionably intended to persuade the vulgar, that whoever purchased one of these indulgences obtained the remission of all his sins, and the certainty of everlasting happiness? It cannot be disputed that the indulgence professed to confer an entire absolution, not only from all past, but also from all future sins. It is impossible, with any shadow of reason, to affix any other meaning to the concluding paragraph. The dilemma, therefore, to which Cardinal Wiseman is reduced is as follows:—either the doctrine of the Church of Rome is the same now as it was in the time of Tetzel and Leo X., or it is not. If it be the same, then Cardinal Wiseman is not to be believed when he tells us that "an indulgence is no pardon for sin of any sort, past, present, or future."—If it be different, then the Church of Rome must have changed her doctrine since the sixteenth century, and, consequently, she cannot be infallible.

We have given a specimen of the language of the documents which Tetzel sold; but we really feel some reluctance in reproducing some passages of the harangues which he is said to have addressed to the people, and in which he magnified the value of his indulgences:—"At the very instant that the money rattles at the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from Purgatory, and flies liberated to heaven. . . . I would not change my privileges for those of St. Peter in heaven; for I have saved more souls by my indulgences than the Apostle by his sermons."

Reflect that for every mortal sin, you must, after confession and contrition, do penance for seven years, either in this life or in Purgatory. Now, how many mortal sins are there not committed in a day, how many in a week, how many in a month, how many in a year, how many in a whole life! . . . Alas! these sins are almost infinite, and they entail an infinite penalty in the fires of Purgatory; and now, by means of these letters of indulgence, you can, once in your life, in every case except four, which are reserved for the Apostolic See, and afterwards in the article of death, obtain a plenary remission of all your penalties and all your sins.

There is no sin so great that an indulgence cannot remit; and even if any one (which is, doubtless, impossible) had offered violence to the Blessed Virgin Mary, mother of God, it is as clear as day-light that if he only procures an indulgence, all will be forgiven him!†

We should be sorry to hold the Church of Rome responsible for the daring impiety of such language as we have quoted above; but at the same time, we feel convinced, that Tetzel only carried out to their logical conclusion the principles which had been laid down by various Popes and Doctors before his time. We have not space to dwell on the fearful abuses and enormities to which such doctrines—proclaimed, be it remembered, by an ordained priest and authorized teacher of the Church of Rome—gave rise throughout Germany. When the princes of the Empire were assembled at the Diet of Nuremberg, they made a complaint of their grievances to the Pope; and, in speaking of indulgences, they unanimously state, as the least bad consequence of them, "that the people were cheated of their money by them;" they then go on to point out far more considerable evils arising from the same pernicious source. "Christian piety," they say, "was destroyed by them; all manner of wickedness did spring from thence; men were afraid of committing no kind of sins, when at so cheap a rate they could purchase a remission of them."‡

We must conclude, for the present, with noticing a prudent piece of advice about indulgences, given to members of the Church of Rome, by Cardinal Bellarmine. "Though the Church," saith he, "may have power to give indulgences, yet they may want their effect in particular persons, and, therefore, all prudent Christians do so receive indulgences, as withal to satisfy God for their sins."§ We hope there are many such "prudent Christians" in Cardinal Wiseman's diocese. The plain meaning of Bellarmine's advice, if he had the courage to speak plainly, is this—that prudent Christians are too wise to believe in indulgences, and that none but fools rely on them; for if there were anything but fraud and imposture in them, why may not a prudent Christian trust a Church which he believes infallible? If Pope Pius IX., on next Easter Sunday, gives a plenary indulgence to every person in the crowd standing at the door of St. Peter's, at Rome, we desire to know why a prudent Christian of that Church may not, yea, ought not to rely upon his word? Does he suspect the head of his Church may cheat and abuse him? If he does, what becomes of infallibility? If he verily believes that the Pope cannot err, and will not deceive, why must not his word be taken? We know not how these things pass current among prudent Christians of the Church of Rome; we would only invite all sincere and earnest members of that Church, who may read what we have written, to contrast the dangerous and contradictory statements of her Popes and divines, on the momentous subject of the forgiveness of sins, with the short and simple statement of the inspired Word of God—"The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from ALL SIN."—1 John i. 7.

OUR LORD GOD THE POPE.

DOMINUS DEUS NOSTER PAPA.

THIS startling, not to say blasphemous, statement was found, during a period of two hundred years, in the Canon Law of the Church of Rome. It occurred in the Gloss upon the Extravagant of John XXII. entitled "*Cum inter*." The Gloss was to the following effect—"To believe that our Lord God the Pope has not the power to decree as he has decreed, is to be deemed heretical."‡ This fearful assertion was naturally laid hold of by the Reformers: and the result of their comments upon it was that the word "God" ("Deus") gradually disappeared from the Gloss, and is now no longer found in the editions of the Canon Law. That modern Roman Catholics should feel anxious to repudiate such a sentiment is not wonderful, when we bear in mind the following points:—

1. St. Paul, speaking of the "Man of Sin," says (2 Thess. ii. 4), that "he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God."
2. Pope Gregory the Great, writing of Antichrist, says, "since he is a damned man and a wicked spirit, he lyingly asserts that he is God."—Greg. in Job, c. 34.
3. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury in the 11th century, also speaking of Antichrist, uses the following words—"He shall feign himself to be religious, that he may deceive men under the colour of piety. Yea, he shall say that he is God: and he shall cause himself to be adored, and shall promise the Kingdom of Heaven."—Anselm in 2 Thess. ii.
4. Long before this, Irenæus, speaking of Antichrist, says, "Being an apostate and a robber, he wishes to be adored as God."—Iren., Contr. Hæc., Lib. v., c. 25.
5. The heathen emperor Domitian headed his proclamations with the words "*Your Lord God Domitian*."—Sueton. in Dom., c. 13. And, similarly, the monster Caligula called himself "*Deus Optimus Maximus*."—Sueton. in Calig., c. 22.

We might expect that when the Reformers urged these and similar points in their controversy with Rome, the Papal authorities would repudiate, as soon as it could be conveniently done, a sentiment which, however useful in the middle ages, could no longer with safety be avowed as the teaching of the Church. It had performed its part in the

great work of building up the edifice of the divine supremacy of the Pope, and might, for the future, be discarded. Yet it seems to have been judged prudent to proceed gradually in the matter. To have at once expunged the obnoxious word *Deum* from the Gloss, would have been too great a concession to the impertinent scruples of Bishop Jewell and other troublesome opponents of the Papal system. Accordingly, when Pope Gregory XIII. appointed a commission in 1582 (nearly twenty years after Jewell had drawn the attention of Europe to the fact that the Pope was God), for the purpose of preparing a new edition of the Canon Law, and with directions to "revise, correct, and expurgate," not only the Text but the Glosses, from unintentional errors as well as designed corruptions, the edition, so prepared (and which is, to the present day, the standard edition), retained the word *Deum*, without even so much as the usual "*Cautela*" in the margin. The explanation of this deliberate retention of the word is, doubtless, to be found in the dogma of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope *de jure divino*, combined with the Papal motto of "no retreat" ("*nuquam retrorsum*"). A few years later, however, that is to say, in the beginning of the 17th century, we have the Jesuit Eudæmon Joannes actually denying that the word "God" (*Deum*) was to be found in the original MS. of Zenzelin, the writer of the Gloss in question. As this MS. is deposited in the Vatican Library, and is carefully concealed from the prying eyes of Protestants, we are obliged to take this denial on trust. How little reason there is for believing Eudæmon's unsupported assertion may be seen by consulting Archbishop Abbott's reply, in his *Antilogia*, cap. 5. Indeed, the candid Mr. Charles Butler seems to admit that this was his impression also, when, in his "Justification" (p. 126), he attempts to justify the phrase "Our Lord God the Pope" upon what he considers Scriptural principles, while he, at the same time, allows that "it is in bad taste." Mr. Butler was well aware that, although the word "*Deum*" has been carefully excluded from the more recent editions of the Canon Law, there are abundant other proofs of the title in question being applied to and accepted by the Popes during the middle ages. He knew that Pope Nicholas I., in the 9th century, had said—"It is sufficiently evident that the secular power cannot bind or loose the Pontiff, who, it is clear, was called God by the pious Prince Constantine; and it is manifest that God cannot be judged by men."—Dist. 96, can. 7. Satis eviderit, Decret. Gratian., Prima Pars.* Mr. Butler doubtless knew also that the famous Chancellor Gerson had said of the Popes, in the early part of the 15th century—"In imitation of Lucifer, they wish to be adored as Gods. . . . They neither fear God, nor reverence man."—De Conc. Gen., Oper. vol. ii., p. 27. Mr. Butler knew further that Christopher Marcellus, addressing Pope Julius II., in the name of the Council of Lateran (1512), made use of the following portentous words—"Do thou take care that we lose not the salvation, the life and breath which thou hast given us. For thou art our shepherd, thou our physician, thou our guide, thou, in short, a second God upon earth (tu denique alter Deus in terris).—Harduin ix., 1651." Mr. Butler knew that Cardillus, in his defence of the Council of Trent, calls the Pope an earthly God (*terrenus Deus*). Mr. Butler was acquainted with the ceremonies observed at the inauguration of a Pope: the following account of which is taken from an official authentic source,† published at the close of the 17th century:—

"After the election and proclamation, the Pope, attired in the pontifical habit, is borne in the pontifical chair to the Church of St. Peter, and is placed on the High Altar, where he is saluted for the third time by the cardinals, by kissing his feet, hands, and mouth. In the meantime the Ambrosian Hymn (*Te Deum*) is sung. The adoration being finished, and the hymn over, the dean of the Sacred College chants some versicles and a prayer; then the Pontiff descends from the altar, and is carried to the Vatican Palace. The ceremony takes place in the Church of St. Peter. The Pontiff is placed upon the High Altar of that Church, a spot consecrated, according to the Romish theory of the Eucharist, by the actual presence of the body, soul, and divinity of the Son of God. He sits upon that High Altar, using it as his footstool. And there, enthroned as a king, he is adored as a God! Adored by the cardinal princes of the Roman Church, who kiss the feet which rest on the altar of the Supreme! And that this is no obsolete usage any one may satisfy himself, by reading the account given of the inauguration of the present Pope, Pius IX., in the *Univers*, of the 27th of June, 1846.

Such being the practice of the Church of Rome at the present day, it may well seem an unnecessary concession to the heretical Reformers to have expunged the word "God" from the Gloss in the Canon Law. But upon nearer consideration the policy of doing so becomes apparent. The formal retention of such a sentiment would, undoubtedly, have proved a very great scandal in this inquiring age; while at the same time care is taken to keep up, in reality, by the practice of the Church of Rome, the claim which, in words, has been withdrawn.

* Gobelini Personæ Cosmodrom. Et. 6, c. 168, p. 278. Francf. ed., 1579.
† Vide "Forma absolutionis plenarie" apud Grædesium, *Monumenta Antiquitatis*. Tom. i., no. vii., B. p. 74.

‡ This last assertion is so monstrous that we deem it right to give it in Tetzel's own published words, in which he deliberately maintained and defended it:—"Sub commissariis insuper ac prædicatoribus veniarum imperare, ut si quis impossibile Dei genericum semper vigorem violasset, quod eundem indulgentiarum vigore absolvere posset, tunc clarius est." Postiones tratis J. Tetzel, quibus defendit indulgentias contra Lutherum, Tueses 92, 100, et 101.

* Vide Centum Gravamina, in Fascic. Rur. Exp. et Fug. p. 354. London, 1630.

† Bell. de Indul., l. i., c. 12, vol. 3, p. 663, col. 2. Prag., 1721.

‡ Extravag. Joan. xxii., Tit. xiv., Gloss. in cap. iv.

* We follow the reading "nequam," instead of the common one, "nequaquam."

* It is a very significant fact, that while Bellarmine quotes the first clause of this sentence as far as the word "Pontiff," in proof of the supremacy of the Pope, he carefully omits the latter part.—Bellarm. de Sum. Pontif., lib. ii., c. 26.

† Notitia Congreg. et Tribunal. Cur. Romanæ. a. H. Lettenburg, 1683.